

THE CANDID EXAMINER.

"EXAMINE YOURSELVES, WHETHER YE BE IN THE FAITH ; PROVE YOUR OWN SELVES."—Paul.

VOL. 2.] MONTROSE, PA. MARCH 19, 1827, NO. 20.

The following controversial letters between Br. Amos Crandal, and Rev. Caleb Kendal, were written a short period previous to the death of Br. Crandal. The letters were the last of his works, and we present them not only on account of their merit, but in respect to the memory of our worthy and esteemed deceased brother.

Hopbottom, Sept. 6, 1823.

Dear Sir,

Believing that you desire to proclaim truth, to promote the declarative glory of God, and advance the happiness of your fellow men, I take my pen in hand to address you, from a principle of friendship, and from a sincere wish for the happiness of mankind. I had the pleasure last sabbath of hearing you discuss Rom. viii. 32 ; with some of the remarks made on the subject I was delighted, but must acknowledge that much of your zealous, (and I have no doubt, well meant,) labour, was to me lost. I say *lost*, because I received no instruction thereby. You asserted, that, "you were disposed to agree with the many learned, and eminent Divines, who held, that the *penalty* of man's transgression, was *Death, Spiritual, Temporal and Eternal*. By "Eternal" I suppose you meant *Endless*. You then introduced Jesus Christ, in the act of making a *bargain* (or covenant) with God, the Father, to *liquidate the debt, or suffer the penalty of man's transgressions*." To me it appeared very strange, that *justice* should be *satisfied* with punishing the *innocent* in the stead of the *guilty*. The payment of the debt alluded to, might be justly represented by a firm: "A, B, and C, are partners in trade, their interest is one, that which belongs to one, belongs to all three, and that which belongs to all three, belongs to either ; A lends D, a fourth person, who is supported by, and entirely dependent on

the firm, a thousand pounds, which he must pay in thirty days, or be imprisoned for life. He fails in the payment, and A orders him thrust into Gaol : B, full of compassion, of which *A can exercise none, (without destroying his justice,)* steps in & pays the debt ;" how can it be made to appear just ? and what *compensation* does the firm receive ? You said, that "no created being could merit any thing," (for another, I conclude you meant,) if this be the case, the death of the man Christ Jesus, could not satisfy any penalty attached to another's transgression. You did not admit that God could die, or the Divine Nature suffer, and therefore did not prove any atonement at all. But admitting that the atonement was made, what was accomplished ? Why, according to your statement, man was thereby placed in a "*salvable state*." To me this is incomprehensible. I find by referring to Mr. Walker, that *salvable*, is a possibility of being saved. According to this idea, man was in a situation from which it was *impossible* he should be *saved*, and Jesus Christ came to *save* him from this situation. If this be reasoning, it is above my capacity. Whether you meant that the death of Christ rendered it *possible* for him to *accomplish man's salvation, or for man to save himself*, I am not able fully to determine ; the latter, however, I conclude, was your meaning. If it is, it contradicts the assertion of the Apostle, Eph. ii. 8. "For by grace are ye saved, (not shall be) through faith, and that *not of yourselves*, it is the *gift of God, not of works lest any man should boast*." You further said, "that Christ came to take away the *sin* of the world, and not the *sins* of the world." I think sir, that the use you make of this word, on account of its bearing the form of a singular, is unwarrantable, the term man, a singular, as well as sin, is frequently used, (and gramatically too) for the whole species : and if it were not, could avail you nothing in argument ; see the testimony :

Dan'l. ix. 24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgressions and to make an end of *sins*, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in Everlasting Righteousness," &c. &c. Math. 1, 21. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their *sins*." John iii. 33. "The Father loveth the son, and hath given all things into his hands." vi. 37. "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." xvii. 2, 3. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give Eternal life to as many as thou hast given him, and this is Life Eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Rom. xi. 7. "For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their *sins*." I have touched lightly on some of your remarks, on these points I should like further instruction, and think you under obligation, from your profession, to give it if you are able. If you will write, your remarks will be received with pleasure. I conceive it to be an act of friendship to correct each others errors, and would receive it of you with gratitude; and rest assured, sir, that I am with sentiments of respect your friend and well wisher.

AMOS CRANDAL.

CALEP KENDAL.

(To be continued.)

MR. EDITOR—I occasionally read a paper printed in Montrose, called, "Baptist Mirror, and Christian Magazine." The motto chosen by the editor is a good one: "He that hath friends must shew himself friendly."—How does the editor shew his friendship to us his friends of other denominations? Is it by courteousness? No—the reverse. He is constantly brandishing his *long sword* at us; he is determined to make us dig up the hatchet, when we would rather smoke the pipe of peace. I am not a man of war, nor do I wish to measure my short and feeble arms, with his long and powerful ones. I am not however surprised at the menacing conduct of the editor of the "Mirror." He has for many years, had a residence in this new country. He may claim the right to hold the minds of the settlers, as he who

first takes possession of wild land. But he may be dealt with, as well as they, before a public and candid community.—The reason of my sending you these few lines, is, to shew you my abhorrence of his ecclesiastical conduct, towards other christian communities, and especially towards the Protestant Episcopal Church. He is the mere echo of the "Western Recorder." He and the editor of that paper, profess to be opposed to the high ground taken by the P. E. Church; whilst at the same time the latter declared to us, that he has reached the summit, and precipitated the poor Episcopalians into the gulph below. Hear what the enemy of the "High Church," (as he is pleased to call them) declares, & then judge for your selves, O candid and discerning public. "The Catholic church claim the right and consider the Episcopal as they do all other dissenters to be heretics. But the *Baptists* do not consider themselves dissenters from the Catholic church, for they had always been a distinct people from the Catholic, and maintain that *Catholics took their rise from dissenters from the Baptist, or Apostolic church*."—This is boasting in earnest—the thing that they disallow the P. Episcopalians, they tolerate in themselves. I do not attempt, Mr. Editor, in these few remarks, a vindication of the P. E. church. My sole object is to shew the public, the bigotry of the editor of the "Mirror," &c.—I challenge the editor of the "Mirror" to make good his assertion, "That Catholics took their rise from dissenters from the Baptist, or (as he is pleased to call the Baptist society) Apostolic church." Let him cover the pages of the paragon *Benedict* and produce his strong argument. We stand prepared to shew the origin of the Baptist order.—There is one more spice of arrogance, in the same column from which we have taken the above, which we lay before the candid public. "And we contend that we can and have proved when infant baptism was introduced, for it was not introduced by Christ or his Apostles, as there is not a word about it in the New Testament." This last flourish of the editor's pen, has placed all who believe in infant baptism, in a very unfavorable point of view. The editor and his adherents, who inveigh against "High Church" principles,

take ground which makes me feel awful. He and they exclude from the Lord's supper all who have not been baptized by immersion. Our saviour has made the partaking of this ordinance obligatory and has no where said that baptism by immersion is to be the condition. Faith is the *condition* of salvation, not baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that *believeth not*, shall be damned," or if you please, condemned. Mark 16, 16. Look at this verse, ye high toned baptists and shudder at the thought, (if ye have the right to administer the ordinances) of shutting the door of the church against any honest and sincere soul who wish to partake with you, but who can not submit to be re-baptized. You lay greater stress upon baptism, than St. Paul, from whom you take several of your supposed proofs. Hear what he says and turn it over and over in your minds. "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus; (here I would inquire, if we might not innocently suppose, that there were small children in "the household of Stephanus"?) besides, I know not whether I baptized any other; for Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel; not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." 1st Cor. 1, 14, 15, 16, 17. From this plain, unambiguous statement of Paul, we infer, that he was not always holding up that ordinance to view. No, repentance & faith were the grand essentials. Baptism with him was not of the same importance. If we are to exclude all from the Lamb's supper in heaven, who have not submitted to be plunged, there will be but very few guests indeed. From such a sentiment, good Lord deliver me.

I can assure the editor of the "Mirror," that he is not taking the wisest course to build up his own party. Harsh means to bring people even to embrace the truth will not succeed. Mildness and meekness, are the most powerful weapons. Let an enemy but shew his sword and we are roused to defence. "He that hath friends must shew himself friendly." But it must not

be that kind of friendship which Vultures shew to lambs. Adieu.

Yours, Respectfully.

* * *

CANDID EXAMINER.

"WHAT IS TRUTH."

MONTROSE, MARCH 19, 1827.

The Lord said, ye have not spoken of me the thing which is right.

I stopped to meet an appointment on my return from a late journey. A Methodist clergyman by the name of Mr. S. delivered a sermon immediately before me; and although a portion of his discourse, was instructing and interesting, yet there were some particulars advanced sufficiently singular and curious, to entitle them to be put on record. His text was in Heb. 2: 2, 3. His principle object appeared to refute the doctrine of universal salvation. To the exquisite hammering which he gave the universalists, we have no particular objection; because as we are in a free country, we had a right to retaliate: But may the good Lord ever preserve us from a disposition to use our civil rights and privileges in this way; for we would always desire to use our privileges as not abusing them.

When he arrived to that part of his discourse which reads; "how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation;" he entered into a close investigation concerning what it is that we escape. Some subordinate things were mentioned; but the great and tremendous doom which we escape by this "great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord," was "divine wrath," "the wrath of God!" This we escape by the great salvation. A number of thoughts voluntarily occur to us by looking on this statement: and the most forcible thought of all is, that this statement is perfectly false. We enquire, who is the author of this great salvation? answer. God. Then God has produced a salvation which saves from his own wrath. What principle in God could move him to originate this salvation. Could it be love? No, for if God loved sinners, he could possess no wrath toward them, from

which they could be saved. Could wrath originate it? No, for wrath would produce its own nature; therefore it could produce nothing but a system of wrath. Wrath in God would not produce a system of mercy and love, to save from his own wrath. But would it be consistent to say that, God saw an injustice in indulging in wrath toward sinners, and therefore, produced a salvation to save them from that wrath which was improper for him to possess? It will not do to acknowledge this. Indeed it is impossible for us to conceive, how that God can be the author of a salvation which saves from his own wrath. Yet God 'sent his son to save the world.' From what? from his own wrath? Let us look at an act like this in common life. A monarch sends his son whom he fondly loves, to save his rebellious subjects, he charges him to spare no cost or pains, and even to give his own life to save them. If the son should enquire of his father from what he should save them, and the father should answer, *from my own wrath and indignation*, should we think him serious? No, we could not be brought to believe that the monarch could be influenced to save his subjects, at so dear a rate, from his own wrath and vengeance which burned against them! Yet this is the exact picture presented us in God, as the author of a salvation from his own wrath. The scriptures affirm that, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." Could we contradict this scripture more palpably, than by saying that, God sent his son to save sinners from his own wrath, when it distinctly asserts that his love toward them, was the moving and sole cause of his sending his son? Again, God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." If God did not love us while we were sinners, how could he commend his love to us, in the death of his son? for he could not commend that which did not actually exist. And if he loved us, he did not send his son to save us from his own wrath.

There is another singular sentiment that Mr. S. advanced which merits inspection. From what he called an objection of "some that sinners will be delivered from punish-

ment when they have suffered to the full amount of their wickedness, and consequently punishment will not be endless," he observed that, "this argument would also go to prove that the happiness of the saints in heaven will have an end also; for when they are rewarded to the amount of their good works, they will have no right to a further continuance in heaven." Therefore concluded "that rewards and punishments in a future state, will be proportioned by degrees of happiness and misery, and not by periods of time—that happiness and misery will be endless but in degree, in proportion to the good and evil conduct of men." These are the precise ideas he advanced, and the language as nearly as we can recollect. This indeed is a very curious picture of a future world. If this be true degrees of happiness and misery, move by almost imperceptible steps from the lowest hell, to the highest heaven.—There will of course be some possessing the lowest seats in heaven, but a step or two above others possessing the highest place in hell. And perhaps some may have a station allotted them on the line of demarkation which divides these two departments of a future world. Although this picture looks perfectly visionary and fabulous, yet it irresistibly involves itself in the doctrine for which so many contend, that men will be punished and rewarded in a future state according to the deeds done in the body: For none will dispute that, there are different and a vast variety of degrees of righteousness and wickedness.—But what surprises us in the supporters of this doctrine, who expect to go to heaven themselves, is, their frequent confessions that, if justice was done them, they would long ago, have been in hell among the damned. How then upon their own principle, do they expect that themselves and some others who justly deserve hell, are going to heaven? Ah! it is through grace, through the merits of Christ. Then it is not through their own merits and works. Therefore, they are not adjudged a seat in heaven proportioned to the measure of their good deeds in the body; for their deeds in the body would sink them to hell.

If men's misery and happiness in a future state, are in exact proportion to their evil and good deeds in the body, grace is

out of the question. These people believe that all sinners deserve endless punishment they also believe that all are sinners. They strenuously and distinctly contend that *every man shall receive in a future state, according to his deeds done in the body.* Now is not that particular in their belief that some will be saved by grace, by the merits of Christ, from this deserved endless punishment, a palpable contradiction of this former point in their faith? And does not their opinion that some are saved by grace, prostrate at once their opinion that men will be happy in heaven in an exact proportion to their deserts? Thus their doctrine is divided against itself; therefore it cannot stand. We never can avoid these difficulties, but by avoiding the doctrines which involve them. It is a truth which cannot be controverted that, wickedness punishes itself—it brings along with itself its own punishment as a necessary consequence. Christ therefore came not to save us from the wrath of God, but from wickedness and sin. When this is done, all their consequences and effects will cease, and not before. The reward of virtue and righteousness. is the enjoyment of virtue and righteousness. They are not rewarded with heaven in a future state. If the most pious and righteous of the earth, examine themselves, and see how far they come short, they will confess that after they have done all they are unprofitable servants—and also confess that if they do not hereafter, possess a heaven better than they merit, by their works, it will not be a heaven worth their enjoying. Therefore, “by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gifts of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.”

And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying great is Diana of the Ephesians.

The reader will remember that in days which have long passed by, the Editor of the Montrose Christian Magazine, entered the lists against the doctrine of final restitution; But on this subject his pen has had a long repose. In this interval of time, he has made an addition to the title of his paper, which is now called, “Baptist Mirror, and Christian Magazine.” After so

long a time, this editor has roused up, like a strong man from a strength giving slumber, and has dashed upon us with a rapidity which lead us to surmise that he designed to carry us by surprise. The reader will naturally inquire, what has roused this Editor from his long protracted repose to so sudden an attack? What grand item in his creed has he thus manfully stopped forth to defend? It is the Devil! the defence of the identity of the Devil!! which has called him up in this great hurry. And we are mortified that a man of his knowledge, talents and judgment has so freely volunteered as the champion of such an impure being. Our 17th number contained a short article in which we discredited the current orthodox notions concerning Devils. It was not our design to provoke a controversy by writing that article; yet it appears from the result, that if we had called a world of subjects over, we could not have chosen one, which would have been more effectual in drawing the Editor of the Baptist Mirror into the field against us, than a subject calculated to bring devils into disrepute. This Editor inserts the article concerning devils found in our 17th No. under the following introduction.

“We insert the following piece from the Examiner, that our readers may become more fully acquainted with the fact, that Universalism is modern Deism. If the article had been extracted from some of the manuscripts of Thomas Paine, and published to prove the malignity of an infidel heart against the truth of revelation, we should have believed that the editor had made a good selection. But when it appears as the real sentiment of the editor of a professed religious paper, it must carry conviction to every enlightened and unprejudiced mind, that Universalism is deism under cover.”

Thus “universalism is modern deism,” “is deism under cover.” Why? because universalists do not believe that devils are just such beings as the orthodox say they are. We have not spoken against God—we have not spoken against Jesus Christ,—but we have spoken against devils. For this we are deists, and hypocrites into the bargain; for we are “deists under cover.” We have dared to speak derogatory to

the dignity of Devils. We have presumptuously presumed, in spite of *priests* and *creeds* to discredit the potent powers which are ascribed to them. For this we are accused of manifesting in ourselves "the malignity of an infidel heart." For this, the judgments of the editor of the Mirror are poured down thick upon us. We are arraigned before his tribunal for speaking against devils. We plead guilty. We have spoken against them and will speak against them still.

We have not room to notice all the remarks of our brother Editor on this subject; nor to answer to all the sentences he has passed upon us. Some of his assertions purport that we deny devils in any sense of the word. In this he is mistaken. We believe that there are devils; but we do not believe that they are just such identical beings as the editor of the Mirror and the orthodox support that they be. We do not credit the common received notions which have long been advanced. The common opinion is that the devil was once an angel of light—an inhabitant of that pure heaven where God and his holy angels preside, and where *nothing entereth that defileth*: that this angel of light became corrupted, rebelled against God, and was cast down to hell; from whence after this world was created, he went and tempted our first parents to sin; and has ever since been engaged in tempting their posterity. These appear to be the views of the Editor of the Mirror, as communicated in the following extract.

"But reader, let us inquire a little farther into this matter, and we shall find that the shafts of Universalists are aimed at Jesus himself, as the inventor of these "airy speculations." The charge will be found against God the father of all, or Moses has been guilty of falsehood; surely Moses must have taken the lead in this "visionary scheme," For he says, "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Gen. 3. 1. The rest of the inspired writers understood Moses to have meant the devil, when he spoke of the serpent. St. John recognizes the doctrine of the identity of the devil when he says, "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the devil, and satan which deceiveth the

whole world, he was cast out into the earth and his angels were cast out with him." John here identifies the devil under the name of the "old serpent, satan and dragon."

Our Editor implies in accordance with the common opinion that, the same *dragon* which was cast out of heaven, was the same *identical serpent* which tempted Eve. How could this be; for the dragon was cast out of heaven, till generations after Adam. This *dragon stood before the woman*, "to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up to God and to his throne." This child was Jesus Christ and after this child was born, and caught up to heaven, "there was war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon", &c. "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the devil," &c. That the dragon was not cast out of heaven till after the world was inhabited, is evident from the following, "Woe to the inhabitants of the earth, and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath." Still this Editor supports that this dragon was an identical spiritual being, and was cast out of heaven previous to the fall of our first parents, and tempted them to sin. We will not attempt at this time to give a full illustration of the dragon whom the saints overcame "by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony." The following testimony of Paul will give a drift to the nature of the subject. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Another difficulty occurs. This common opinion of the devil supports that, he is confined to hell, and at the same time all over creation. Dr. Watts whose orthodoxy on this point our editor will not dispute, speaking of a dismal hell, says,

"There Satan the first sinner lies,
And roars and bites his iron bands;
In vain the rebel strives to rise,
Crush'd with the weight of both thy hands.

Here we find the devil bound with "iron bands," in vain striving to rise, and crush-

ed "with the weight of both the hands of the Almighty; and and at the same time "going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. If this devil is so closely and securely confined to this "dismal hell," we should like to know how it can be made out that he is dashing about all over creation, superintending all the vast concerns of wickedness? If this be the case, he must be *omniscient* and *omnipotent*! But this Editor says, "Moses has taken the lead in this "visionary scheme." Well what does he quote from Moses to prove this? "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Moses here represents the serpent as a *beast of the field which the Lord God had made*. But this visionary scheme against which we have spoken, supports that he is a fallen angel—an immortal, spiritual, identical spirit. This does not agree with Moses, for he represents him as a *beast of the field*; and when God cursed him, he said, "thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field." There is no way we can reconcile this subject with itself and other scriptures, than to conclude that Moses spoke figuratively, and that he represented that principle which tempts us, by a wily serpent. What is that which tempts us? "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed." "In me that is in my flesh dwelleth no good thing." "I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." "Now the works of the flesh are manifest." Then the apostle enumerates every evil work and communication, and attributes them all to the flesh, or the law in our members: But we notice an objection of our Editor. He says, "Christ was declared to be holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners" &c. "and could not be tempted by a depraved heart." Very true. But "the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same."—Christ took part of *flesh and blood*—his hu-

man, mortal constitution was *flesh and blood*. But if Christ was not subject to the temptations of flesh and blood, where is the glory of his victory over flesh and blood. Sin, nor depravity does not consist in being tempted, but in yielding to the temptation; and Christ being possessed of flesh and blood, and not yielding in the least degree to their influence, is an evidence of his immaculate and invulnerable holiness, rather than an evidence of depravity. Paul said, "in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." Again, "we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities: but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."—Thus we learn *Christ was made in all points like unto his brethren* of the human family, *touched with the feelings of their infirmities*, tempted in *all points* like as we are—But remember "yet without sin." All the above quotations are plain literal language, and is it consistent to put such constructions on figurative hyperbolical language, as to make it contradict that which is literal and plain, especially when these figurative expressions can be most naturally explained to agree with the literal.

This Editor further states. "that the same mode of reasoning that is calculated to do away the idea of the identity of devils, would also do away the doctrine of the identity of God, and leave us in the gulf of Atheism." Thus you do away this Editor's opinion of devils, and you do away his God—the one stands on as permanent a foundation as the other. *Atheism* we thought was to deny the existence of a God, and it appears to deny the existence of the orthodox Devil is the same thing. O, our cruel fate to be subject to the charge of *Atheism*, for not believing in the same sense that our editor believes, in the sable *king of hell*. But we rejoice that we believe in a God who presides in the plenitude of his own power, manifesting himself in all the works of providence and nature, whose existence and perfections are demonstrated in the true record of scripture the validity of which is confirmed by a train of circumstances and miracles as undisputed as the light of the noon day which he bids to shine. Neither is his being established by the being of Devils nor

the truth of his existence, confirmed by their existence ; but when all the Devils which ever roamed on earth or floated on the brain of man, shall have been swept to everlasting oblivion, still he will preside in the fulness of his own perfections, shedding light and heaven on the fair fields of his creation.

We will give one more extract from the Mirror.

"If there is 'no devil no hell, no angry God,' we need no Christ ; why then should we believe in him? Ah, it is easy to see their reason, they must be as 'Christ's ministers,' i. e. they must have the name, or their true characters would be seen, and there would be no deception, it would not do to come out to the light and declare openly against all revelation, That has been tried and failed. Let us now hear the language of infidelity, even the language of the Editor of the Examiner.—'The stories of witches which have shook the nerves of thousands with terror, have now become fables. And as the sun of REASON rises upon the people, these devils recede like Ghosts which only walk in the night.' Thomas Paine had an *age of reason*, Universalists have a *sun of reason*. Both deny the testimony of the Bible."

We tell this Editor that we believe in a devil and a hell ; but not in that devil in which he believes, nor in that hell where the orthodox represent the devil as being securely confined at the same time he is sojourning over all the face of the earth.—Was the Devil once an *angel of light* ? did he become corrupted and rebellious in that place where nothing *entereth that defileth, or loveth and maketh a lie* ? does he pervade and fill so many places at the same time, possessing an omnipresence like that of God ? This we cannot at present believe. This therefore, we have spoken against.

From the Christian Register.

MR. EDITOR.—The following notes were found in the pocket book of a young lady after her decease. If you think their publication would be useful, they are at your disposal.

"A few things which I desire constantly to keep in mind.

1st. That it is the object of my life to prepare my soul for the enjoyments of heaven, and to do all in my power to assist my fellow creatures in attaining the same end.

2d. That the eye of my God is at all times upon me.

3d. That I must keep a constant watch upon my thoughts, words, and actions, and hourly carry on the work of self-examination.

4th. Let the love of God and gratitude to my Saviour, for what he has done for me, be the predominant emotions of my soul.

5th. Let the example of purity and holiness which Jesus has given us in his life, be my standard of virtue, and let this be the object upon which my mental eye is continually fixed.

6th. Let me be ever striving to increase my stock of religious knowledge.

7th. Let me ever remember that prayer is the most solemn act in which I can be engaged, and let me never enter upon it with levity or without preparation.

8th. When I read the Bible let it be as I would read a message directly from the Most High."

From the Reformer.

BEGGING.

Hard begging and innumerable schemes and inventions will be required to keep up the existence and operation of the various plans which have been got up under pretence of spreading religion ; and yet after all they will ultimately come to nought, as is already the case with some ;—witness the famous Jews' Society and the Foreign Mission School. As they originated wholly in the will and wisdom of men, & have no warrant from the New Testament, like all other human inventions they will never promote the cause of Christ, and will exist only for a time.

The baptismal admonition of the Hindoo, is as impressive to the by-standers as it is beautiful. "Little babe—thou entered the world weeping, while all around you smiled ; contrive so to live that you may depart in smiles, while all around you weep."

Printed every other Monday, by DIMOCK & FULLER, at \$1 per annum, for C. R. MARSH, Editor, to whom letters and communications postage paid, may be directed.